DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 286 889 TM 870 484

AUTHOR Morris, Donald R.
TITLE Evaluation of the Dade County Public Schools Roving Leaders Outreach Program.
INSTITUTION Dade County Public Schools, Miami, FL. Office of Educational Accountability.
PUB DATE Mar 86
NOTE 27p.; Executive summary is printed on colored paper.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Basic Skills; *Institutionalized Persons; *Nontraditional Education; Nontraditional Students; *Outreach Programs; Participant Satisfaction; Performance Contracts; *Program Evaluation; Secondary Education; *Special Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Dade County Public Schools FL; *Roving Leaders Outreach Program

ABSTRACT

The Roving Leaders Center, one of the Dade County (Florida) Public Schools' Educational Alternative Outreach Programs, is designed as a last resort beyond the opportunity schools. Although it originally involved counselors who visited the schools, it now consists of a classroom, recreation room, offices, and reception area. It is staffed by a coordinator, an instructor and instructor's aide, a secretary, and a job developer. The program has embraced 69 adolescent students who have stayed with the program between 6 and 437 days (with an average of 132). The 22 students currently in attendance in June, 1985, completed a questionnaire evaluating the program and surveying students' future plans. The questionnaire, tabulated results, and student responses about their future goals are appended. All students reported that they expected to graduate from high school. An additional 15 students who had left the program to reenter the school system were followed by means of telephone interviews with their counselors. The Roving Leaders program was judged to compare favorably with other similar programs regarding attendance; improvement in behavior and performance seemed to be related to how recently the student had left an outreach program. It was recommended that the program be retained but not necessarily duplicated. (MGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED286889

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

EVALUATION OF THE DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

ROVING LEADERS OUTREACH PROGRAM

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Turner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
PROGRAM EVALUATION DEPARTMENT

MARCH 1986

TM 870 484

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE SCHOOL BOARD OF DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

Mr. Robert Renick, Chairman
Dr. Kathleen B. Magrath, Vice-Chairman
Mr. G. Holmes Braddock
Mr. Paul Cejas
Dr. Michael Krop
Ms. Janet R. McAliley
Mr. William H. Turner

Dr. Leonard Britton
Superintendent of Schools

EVALUATION OF THE DCPS ROVING LEADERS OUTREACH PROGRAM

Principal Evaluator/Author: Donald R. Morris, Ph.D.

Dade County Public Schools
Office of Educational Accountability
1450 Northeast Second Avenue
Miami, Florida 33132

March 1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background 2

The Outreach Program 2

Roving Leaders 2

A Profile of the Student Body 4

Evaluation 5

Students Currently in Roving Leaders 6

Former Roving Leaders Students Remaining in the School System 8

Discussion and Recommendations 11

Evaluation of the DCPS Roving Leaders Outreach Program

Executive Summary

The Roving Leaders Center is one of fourteen centers in the Outreach Program. It is described as a contracted non-residential alternative school program. Initially it was designed as a last resort beyond the opportunity schools. Later admissions were broadened to include students in the work-back program. In addition, some parents who have heard of the center have requested that their children be granted entry. This is the only center of its kind, and it serves the North and North Central areas.

The evaluation consisted of collecting data on the students who had attended Roving Leaders as of May, 1985, and analyzing it in two parts; the examination of certain aspects of the students remaining in the program, and a followup of the students who, although they have left Roving Leaders, have remained in the school system.

The Roving Leaders Program was found to be an adequate but not unique program that should be retained but not necessarily duplicated. The program might profit from greater communications and interaction with similar and/or complimentary programs within and without the school system.

The evaluation led to the following recommendations.

1. Support for the Roving Leaders center should be continued.

2. Efforts should be made to increase communications and cooperation among the various school and community programs which have similar or complimentary objectives.

3. The feasibility of holding an annual conference involving all alternative schools and programs, to be sponsored, arranged, and supervised by Outreach, should be considered.

4. Any decision to add to the capacity to serve students in the way that Roving Leaders does, should be based on a more general criterion of increasing facilities, and not on the concept of a need for a school that replicates the characteristics of the Roving Leaders program.

Background

The Outreach Program

The DCPS Outreach Program is officially described in Program documentation as follows:

> The Educational Alternative Outreach Program is comprised of fourteen centers which serve youngsters who are outside the mainstream of the regular school programs. The number of students enrolled in the Program fluctuates, but averages approximately 550 students. A standard academic program is provided in each center, with the emphasis in basic skills. Other subject areas include pre-vocational classes, art, physical education, exceptional student education, English for Speakers of other Languages (ESOL), and General Education Development (GED).
>
> The fourteen school centers in the Outreach Program are of five major types: detention centers, drug/alcohol centers, rehabilitation centers, intervention programs, shelter homes and contracted centers. Referrals to, or placement in these programs is based on chronic or severe school adjustment problems, substance abuse, run-away and/or dependent children, removal from the alternative school, adjudication of delinquency by the juvenile court, and placement in detention while awaiting adjudication.

The program has a high turnover. There were more than 4000 entries and withdrawals in 1984-85 alone.

Roving Leaders

Description. One of the fourteen above-mentioned centers is Roving Leaders (RL). The Roving Leaders Center is described as a contracted non-residential alternative school program. Oversight by the school system is exercised by regular, unannounced visits on the part of Outreach personnel. In addition, an Outreach representative sits in on the interviews when RL hires a new (certified) teacher, although the final choice is up to the RL staff.

The project coordinator reported (4/19/85) that during the first year of operation it was an Outreach program where counselors went out into the schools. For the past two years it has been a place where students come. Outreach personnel added that originally (two years ago) it was designed as a last resort beyond the opportunity schools. Later the concept of the center was broadened to include the work-back program. In addition, a few students, unable to adjust when returned to the system, have requested to return and were permitted to do so. In addition, some parents who have heard of the center have requested that their children be granted entry. This is the only center of its kind, and it serves the North and North Central areas. The

Outreach people say there is great need for one like it to serve the South and South Central areas.

Physical Plant. The Roving Leaders school is located in the North Central area at 630 N.W. 62 street, near Miami-Edison Senior High School. The school area consists of a classroom, recreation room, office and reception area, and office space for the coordinator/counselor. The equipment is standard (chairs, tables, chalkboard, etc.) and appears adequate.

The staff consists of four persons: a coordinator, an instructor, an instructor's aide, and a secretary. There is also a fifth person, a "job developer", whose position is maintained by the Partners for Youth program, through a grant from the Dade County Government. This person reports regularly to the county government but apparently not at all to the School Board. There is no mention of the position in any of the correspondence between the school and the Outreach program.

Procedures and Services. In the published description of the Outreach program, the criteria for placement in Roving Leaders is stated to be: Youngsters who cannot adapt to the opportunity school setting, or who are referred in lieu of expulsion may be placed in the program by DCPS. An age range (14 to 18) is given rather than grade levels. Placement is determined entirely by the Outreach Program, and not by RL staff. In addition to the above criteria, a few students, unable to adjust when returned to the system, have requested to return and were permitted to do so. Also some parents who have heard of the center have requested that their children be granted entry.

Cumulative and school records are kept at the Outreach offices in the School Board Administration Building, on all currently enrolled students. Current files, attendance, and a running commentary of anecdotal data are kept on each student while they are enrolled in Roving Leaders.

Incoming students are tested for academic placement with the Sucher-Allred Reading Placement Inventory, the Wide Range Achievement Test, and the Working with Numbers Mastery Test.

The RL schedule provides for a 6 period day. In the published release, the educational program is specified to be: Language Arts, Math, Social Studies, Science, Physical Education, and Alternative To Conflict. A memorandum from the school's Program Director to the Coordinator dated December 5, 1984 gives the school's actual schedule, consisting of six periods and a study hall. A copy of the memorandum is included as Appendix A.

Other Services. Transportation is provided by the DCPS, and lunches are brought in from nearby Edison Senior High.

The Roving Leaders program participates in the Partners for Youth program, sponsored by the county government. A Partners for

Youth representative, or "job developer", was paid on a grant from them, during the 1984-85 year. She filled out a report to the county each month, but none to anyone in DCPS. At the end of the year the RL secretary held files to the effect that the job developer had found jobs for the following numbers of students:

March	5 students
April	3
May	9
June	est. 10-12

The data on employment was only reported from March, and no June report was made.

Classroom Behavior. The coordinator has reported that behavior in the classroom is a minimal problem at RL. Truancy and poor academic performance are the major problems of the students sent here, and the academic performance is usually a function of the attendance. On the average, the coordinator reported, some 20-25 students attend on a given day, with more at mid-week than at the beginning or end. A system of reinforcement is employed, using a point system, with rewards for being on time, participation, and "attendance this week".

Two classroom visits, both announced, were made by the evaluator. For the first, 15 students were in attendance. Both teacher and aide were present. The classroom was very quiet, with students absorbed in individual tasks. During the second, a questionnaire was administered to the 22 attending students, with the assistance of the coordinator, the teacher, and the aide. Students were on the whole very cooperative.

A Profile of the Student Body

A list of 69 names was obtained from Outreach personnel, including all the students who had participated in the program from its inception until 4/25/85. Selected information was obtained from the master MIS files for each student on the list. The average age was 17.11 years with a standard deviation of 1.41 years. The oldest student was 19.59 years and the youngest 12.61 years. Grade status ranged from the 7th through the 12th. Two were of hispanic origin, the remainder non-hispanic black. Twenty were female and 49 male. Thirty of the 69 students, or 43 percent of the total, were still in the Roving Leaders program.

Fifty-eight percent of the 69 students considered have spent time in outreach programs other than Roving Leaders, or in an opportunity school, in either the current location or one or both of the last two previous locations. Thirty-five percent have been to MacArthur North opportunity school.

Table 1 gives the length of stay in Roving Leaders, and in these other schools, in days. Number of days represents the total time

elapsed from entry to withdrawal summed for all schools of this type in which the student was enrolled.

Table 1
Length of Stay in an Outreach
Program or Opportunity School
(in Consecutive Days from Entry to
Withdrawal, summed across last 3 locations)

	Roving Ldrs	Other	Combined
Average	131.72	73.58	205.30
Std.Dev.	91.12	95.32	129.89
Maximum	437	379	732
Minimum	6	0	6

The average stay in Roving Leaders is 132 days, but the standard deviation is large indicating considerable variability in this figure. The average of 132 days works out to be 18.8 weeks (or about four and a half months). One fourth of the 69 students were in Roving Leaders for 9 weeks or less, and a fourth were there for more than 195 days. One student had been there well over a year (437 days).

The average stay of one of these students in the combined outreach-opportunity school setting was 205 days, or about seven months, but again the large standard deviation indicates great variability. The range is from 6 to 732 days. The much smaller average and comparatively larger standard deviation for the "other" category reflects the fact that many of these students (in fact some 42 percent of them), have come to Roving Leaders directly from the regular system. This "60/40 split" of students from two different sources (some directly from the regular schools, and others from opportunity school backgrounds) suggests that there may be two quite different sets of students here, those from a regular school who make one big mistake (such as carrying a weapon, for example), and those whose past attendance at opportunity schools suggest a more chronic problem history.

Thirty-nine of the 69 students on the obtained list have, in one way or another, left the program. The breakdown is given in Table 2. Of these 39, 18 (or 46 percent), have returned to the public school system. Of those who have left the system, only 2 are known to have gone on to gainful employment.

Evaluation

The evaluation has consisted, in addition to the collection of the data heretofore presented, of two parts; the examination of certain aspects of the students remaining in the program, and a

Table 2
Students Who Have Left the Roving Leaders Program

Destination	Number	Percent of Those Moved on	Percent of Total
Returned to:	18	46	23
regular system	11		
opportunity school	4		
adult education	1		
telecommunications	2		
Out-of-School:	9	23	13
expelled	2		
Dade Co. jail	1		
correctional instit.	1		
FSB-Okeechobee	3		
enlistment	1		
employment	1		
Indeterminate:	12	31	17
moved	1		
non-attendance	8		
no-show 84-85	3		

followup of the students who, although they have left Roving Leaders, have remained in the school system.

Students Currently in Roving Leaders

A questionnaire was administered at the Roving Leaders school on the morning of June 5, 1985, to all students in attendance, a total of 22. Sixteen of the responding students were among the 30 enrolled students for which background data had been gathered, and 6 were students who arrived after the list had been compiled.

The questionnaire was made up of 11 items, 9 of which were constructed to guage the students' reactions to the school and staff. A final 2 questions concerned the students' expectations for graduation and beyond. The questionnaire (complete with weights assigned to the various alternatives), and the tabulated results are included in Appendices 2 and 3.

Variables for Analysis. Using the data from the questionnaire and other collected information, 5 quantitative measures were developed for analysis of the students remaining in the program.

These were:

RLtime: The total time in days spent in the Roving Leaders program, computed as described elsewhere in this report.

Otime: The total time in days spent in other outreach and/or opportunity school programs, computed the same way as RLtime described above.

Item 11: The item on the questionnaire requesting the respondent to state post-graduation plans. Responses were judgmentally coded to reflect degree of realism of stated aspirations (see appendix B for an explanation of the coding scheme, and appendix C for the responses).

Qscore: The first 9 questions on the questionnaire reflect in various ways the students' general assessment of the Roving Leaders program. The weights given to the various responses are indicated on the copy included in appendix 2. A Qscore indicating the percent of responses favorable was computed for each respondent.

Success ranking (called Rank): The counselor's ranking of currently enrolled students in terms of their ability (relative to each other) to cope with their environment upon leaving the program. Those students about which the counselor did not feel qualified to judge were omitted from the ranking. [For purposes of analysis, rank 1 = least successful.]

Results. The Qscore results showed the respondents to be approving of the Roving Leaders program, but not overwhelmingly so. The average Qscore was 67, with a standard deviation of 18.

One thing that stood out in the questionnaire results was a certain degree of unrealistic optimism. For one thing, all respondents reported that they expected to finish high school. For another, in coding the responses to item 11 (plans for the future), less than half - 41 percent - were ranked (by the evaluator) as completely realistic, and 27 percent (6 responses) were judged totally unrealistic. The variable item 11 is included in Table 3 below, to try to examine the relationship of this lack of realism to other relevant variables.

The correlation matrix for the variables listed above is given in Table 3. None of the relationships is particularly strong, but they do reveal a plausible pattern of interaction.

For one thing, the validity of the "realism" measure,(item 11) is reinforced by the fact that it is positively related to rank (the strongest relationship found), the counselor's estimate of the student's ability to successfully cope with his environment. In turn, the more realistic tend to evaluate Roving Leaders more favorably (have higher Qscores), and also to have less time in

the Roving Leaders program.

Table 3
Relationships Between Time-in-Program(s)
and Selected Variables for Students
Currently Enrolled in the Roving Leaders Program

	RLtime	Otime	Item11	Qscore	Rank
RLtime	1.000	0.236	-0.173	-0.426	-0.325
Otime		1.000	0.041	0.009	0.086
Item 11			1.000	0.291	0.447
Qscore				1.000	0.411
Rank					1.000

There is no relationship between Otime and any of the variables under analysis, but RLtime - the time spent in Roving Leaders - is negatively related to the other variables. Not only is there a slight tendency to decrease as realism increases (as mentioned above), but there is a moderately strong (for this grouping) tendency to decrease as favorable opinions of the program increase (i.e. the longer the time in the program, the less favorable the opinion of it is likely to be). Finally, the counselor's estimate of the student's ranking tends to decrease as time in the program increases.

Lastly, the counselor also tends to rate those with high Qscores highly.

In summary, the students who rate the program most highly tend to be those who score high on realism, and who are rated likely to succeed. They also tend to be the students with less time in the program. The most reasonable interpretation of this is that these students are the ones who derive the most benefit from the program and are consequently sent back to the school system earlier, leaving the more unrealistic and discontented to accumulate time in the program. This is not intended to imply that the program promotes discontent or a reduction of a realistic perspective, but rather the commonplace observation that those who are best prepared attitudinally when they arrive are most likely to be the first to leave. This in turn implies that the program is operating with reasonable efficiency, retaining those who are less prepared to return to the system.

Former Roving Leaders Students Remaining in the School System.

Fifteen students were identified who had spent time in the Roving Leaders program and who were enrolled in regular or opportunity school classes in the spring of 1985. Counselors at the schools where these students were in attendance were contacted and

information collected via telephone interviews concerning the students' attendance, academic performance, and behavior. The processing of this information for use in the analysis is described in the notes accompanying Tables 4 and 5.

Referring to Table 4, the Roving Leaders program compares very favorably with other programs of a similar nature with respect to school attendance after leaving the program. The tau-c coefficient of .49 indicates a moderate positive relationship between attendance at the current school site, and time spent in the Roving Leaders program (measured in days as earlier described). The relationship for other programs is also positive but weaker. On the other hand, Otime appears to do much better than Roving Leaders at influencing performance. Neither seems to have any effect on behavior.

Table 4
Students Who Have Returned to the School System from Roving Leaders:
Association* of Coded Counselor-reported Status on Selected Performance Variables, with Time in Outreach/Opportunity Programs

	RL	Other
Attendance	0.49	0.31
Behavior	0.02	-0.05
Performance	0.08	0.33

* The measure of association is Kendall's tau-c, with the column variables dichotomized at the mean.
The column variables represent time spent in outreach programs and/or opportunity schools, by location sequence.
RL: the Roving Leaders program.
Other: any opportunity school or any outreach program other than Roving Leaders.
The row variables represent codings of counselor assessments as reported in phone interviews:
Attendance, coded -1 for poor, 0 for fair, 1 for good.
Behavior, coded same as attendance, above.
Performance, the counselor's opinion on whether the student will pass the year, coded -1 for no, 0 for doubtful, and 1 for will definitely pass the year.

The Otime variable, representing chiefly time spent in opportunity schools, is of some substantive significance in this context. It was suggested earlier that students who wind up in

Roving Leaders may be of two distinct groups - those with chronic problems (represented here by those who have a lot of Otime), and those who have made one serious mistake. Of 14 students returned to the system for whom unequivocal data is available, 6 had 24 or more days of Otime, and 8 had none. Table 4, in which the Otime measure was dichotomized at the mean, effectively captures this group difference, and the indication is that students who have had this Otime experience perform better upon returning to the system than those who did not. Since all students considered have had RL experience also, the implication is that RL has a greater impact on the performance of those with time in other similar programs also.

This line of reasoning suggests that the particular program may not be nearly so influential as simply the time in any such programs, and that it is not useful to think in terms of two types of students, but rather in terms of amount of experience with this type of program. Table 5 gives the tau-c values for the relationships, using a breakdown by 2nd and 1st previous locations, rather than type of program.

Table 5
Students Who Have Returned to the School System from Roving Leaders:
Association* of Coded Counselor-reported Status on Selected Performance Variables, with Time in Outreach/Opportunity Programs

	2nd	1st	1+2
Attendance	0.49	0.55	0.67
Behavior	-0.27	0.66	0.49
Performance	0.22	0.43	0.29

* The measure of association is Kendall's tau-c, with the column variables dichotomized at the mean.
The column variables represent time spent in outreach programs and/or opportunity schools, by location sequence.
2nd: second previous location
1st: first previous location
1+2: first and second previous locations
The row variables represent codings of counselor assessments as reported in phone interviews:
Attendance, coded -1 for poor, 0 for fair, 1 for good.
Behavior, coded same as attendance, above.
Performance, the counselor's opinion on whether the student will pass the year, coded -1 for no, 0 for doubtful, and 1 for will definitely pass the year.

For attendance, the relationship for the 2nd previous location is as great as it is for the RL program. In fact, there is a moderate positive relationship between attendance and time in either 2nd or 1st location, rising to a rather strong .67 when both are combined. This is reasonably clear indication that attendance is likely to improve with length of time spent in any one or combination of these programs.

The pattern of the relationship for behavior is different. The correlation with time in 1st previous location is fairly strong (.66), and with the 2nd previous weakly negative, and when the information from the two locations is combined the value of the relationship is not strengthened. This suggests that the temporal proximity of the experience, rather than length of time in program, is the most probable explanatory effect in this case.

For both 2nd and 1st locations the performance variable reflects a pattern similar to the attendance variable, but it is much weaker, and most likely represents a consequence of the improvement in attendance. However, the drop in the coefficient (from the 1st location value) when the locations are combined indicates that the effect is not cumulative; that the effect on performance - like that on behavior - diminishes with time away from the "treatment".

To sum up, the total amount of time spent in all outreach/ opportunity school programs is a better predictor of attendance for the student returned to the regular system, than is type of program. Similarly, behavior and performance are affected less by type of program than by how recently the student has left any such program.

Discussion and Recommendations

The following questions are addressed within the scope of the foregoing evaluation.

How successful has Roving Leaders been?

It depends on one's perspective. A quick look at Table 2 will show that fully 46 percent of those who had at some previous time attended Roving Leaders were still in the public school system as of May, 1985. Lacking any data from other similar programs with which to compare, it is impossible to know whether this is a better or worse showing than one might reasonably expect from this expenditure of resources. However, one can say that the performance of the program has been 46 percent better than the worst conceivable situation (zero percent), and it is reasonable to assume that this is an acceptable improvement over that result.

1. It is recommended that support for the Roving Leaders center be continued.

Is adequate contact maintained with external programs of a complimentary nature?

The Partners for Youth program, sponsored by the county government and local businesses, operated at Roving Leaders throughout the 1984-85 year, furnishing an extra person and additional services at no expense to the school system. Jobs were reported found for some 27-29 students in the course of the year. There was no communication or cooperation between the agency and the school system, and district-level Outreach personnel had no knowledge of the existence of the program, despite its obvious value to the Roving Leaders center. This experience clearly demonstrates the need for better communication.

2. Efforts should be made to increase communications and cooperation among the various school and community programs which have similar or complimentary objectives.

Should intraprogram communications be increased?

The lack of communication and cooperation mentioned above extends to affairs among the centers within the Outreach program. Discussions with RL staff revealed that they are not aware of the activities or procedures of any of the other Outreach programs. Discussion with an administrator at another Outreach location, larger and with a much more highly structured program, further revealed that no one at that location had ever heard of Roving Leaders, nor had anything more than an awareness of any of the other outreach programs. Without criticism or reflection on any of the programs, there would seem to be much that the various contracted schools could learn from each other, and no way for them to ever get together.

3. The feasibility of holding an annual conference involving all alternative schools and programs, to be sponsored, arranged, and supervised by Outreach, should be considered.

Is another center like Roving Leaders needed?

Outreach personnel point out that Roving Leaders is the only center of its kind, and it serves only the North and North Central areas. They further indicate that there is great need for one like it to serve the South and South Central areas.

Among the results of the evaluation analysis was the finding that Roving Leaders as a particular program seemed to be much less important than the total amount of time spent in any combination of programs of the outreach or opportunity type (for attendance), or the time elapsed since leaving an outreach program or opportunity school (for behavior or performance). This makes it difficult to distinguish the effects of this program from those of similar programs. It is possible that continuing to modify

and broaden the criteria for entry has undermined the distinctive nature of the RL program, causing its effects to become ever more similar to other programs of this kind, as the types of student served increasingly overlap. This does not detract from the program's usefulness, but it does suggest that it is not unique.

It may be that the reasons for a center of this kind are broader than its effects on attendance, behavior, or performance, and so beyond the scope of this report. In that case no recommendation can be made one way or the other concerning the need for more like it, without further inquiry of a comparative nature. Within the limits of this evaluation however, the conclusion must be that there does not appear to be anything unique about Roving Leaders that necessitates a duplication of this particular program.

4. Any decision to add to the capacity to serve students in the way that Roving Leaders does, should be based on a more general criterion of increasing facilities, and not on the concept of a need for a school that replicates the characteristics of the Roving Leaders program.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

TO: Dorrin D. Rolle, Program Director

December 5, 1984

FROM: Robert Alexander, Coordinator/Counselor

SUBJECT: STAFF WORK SCHEDULE (A) - SCHOOL SCHEDULE (B)

The schedule below is being submitted for your perusal and if acceptable, your approval:

(A) Staff Work Schedule

Robert Alexander, Coordinator/Counselor	8:15 - 4:00 p.m.
Victor Paxton, Instructor	8:15 - 3:30 p.m.
Pauline Thompson, Instructor's Aide	9:00 - 4:30 p.m.
Sharon Fields, Secretary	9:00 - 1:00 p.m.

(B) School Schedule

8:00 a.m. - 8:50 a.m.		Study Hall
9:00 a.m. - 9:50 a.m.	1st. period	English
10:00 a.m. -10:50 a.m.	2nd. period	Math
11:00 a.m. -11:50 a.m.	3rd. period	Science
12:00 a.m. -12:35 a.m.		Lunch
12:40 a.m. - 1:30 p.m.	4th. period	History, Civics, Government, Social Studies
1:40 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.	5th. period	Physical Education
2:40 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.	6th. period	Reading

RA:sf

Appendix B

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
ROVING LEADERS STUDENT SURVEY

NAME _____

Please answer the following questions so that we can get an idea of how much you like the Outreach Program (Roving Leaders) and what changes you would like to see in the Program (if any).

For each item below, please check ( ) the most correct answer.

[Numbers in brackets beside the response options are the codes used to enter the responses into the database.]

1. How do you like this school compared to the one which you last attended?

[3] ___ better
[2] ___ about the same
[1] ___ worse

2. How easy is it to get help from the staff (teacher, counselor) at this school compared to the one you last attended?

[3] ___ easier
[2] ___ about the same
[1] ___ harder

3. When you have a problem with your school work, are you able to get help from your teachers?

[4] ___ always
[3] ___ most of the time
[2] ___ sometimes
[1] ___ hardly ever

4. When you have a personal problem, are you able to get help from your teachers or counselor?

[4] ___ always
[3] ___ most of the time
[2] ___ sometimes
[1] ___ hardly ever

5. Is this school (Roving Leaders) different from the school which you attended previously?

[3] ___ yes, quite a bit
[2] ___ yes, somewhat
[1] ___ no, not really

6. If you think this school is different, then how is it different? (Check as many as apply):

[1 for each chk] ___ school work is easier
___ I better understand what I am supposed to do
___ staff (teacher and counselor) is friendlier
___ more help is available when I need it
___ school work is more interesting
___ I get along better with other kids
___ there are fewer students in my class
[1*] ___ other (write-in) _[* -1 for each negative comment]_____

7. How much do you feel that you are learning at this school compared to the one which you last attended?

[3] ___ more
[2] ___ about the same
[1] ___ less

8. Do you think that you're getting a better idea of what kinds of jobs are available when you get out of school from attending this school than you were from the previous school?

[1] ___ yes [0] ___ no

9. If you had your choice, where would you like to attend school next fall?

[3] ___ I'd like to stay at this school
[2] ___ I'd like to go back to my old school
[1] ___ I'd rather go to some other school (do you have one in mind ?_____)

10. Do you think that you will be able to graduate from High School?

[1] ___ yes [0] ___no

11. What do you plan to do after you get out of school? _____

_____[Judgmentally coded: 2 realistic_____

_____1 unlikely but possible_____

_____0 fantasy_____

_____blank: no or trite response]_____

Appendix C

ROVING LEADERS STUDENT SURVEY
Responses

Responses to the questionnaire, administered to 22 students in the Roving Leaders program on June 5, 1985. The first number beside each alternative is the number responding, the number in parentheses is the percent of the total responding.

1. How do you like this school compared to the one which you last attended?

   13 (59%) better
   7 (32%) about the same
   2 (09%) worse

2. How easy is it to get help from the staff (teacher, counselor) at this school compared to the one you last attended?

   12 (55%) easier
   8 (36%) about the same
   2 (09%) harder

3. When you have a problem with your school work, are you able to get help from your teachers?

   12 (55%) always
   6 (27%) most of the time
   3 (13%) sometimes
   1 (05%) hardly ever

4. When you have a personal problem, are you able to get help from your teachers or counselor?

   7 (32%) always
   9 (41%) most of the time
   4 (18%) sometimes
   2 (09%) hardly ever

5. Is this school (Roving Leaders) different from the school which you attended previously?

   18 (82%) yes, quite a bit
   3 (13%) yes, somewhat
   1 (05%) no, not really

6. If you think this school is different, then how is it different? (Check as many as apply):

7	(32%)	school work is easier
15	(68%)	I better understand what I am supposed to do
16	(73%)	staff (teacher and counselor) is friendlier
15	(68%)	more help is available when I need it
16	(73%)	school work is more interesting
8	(36%)	I get along better with other kids
9	(41%)	there are fewer students in my class

Other ways Roving Leaders is different (write in):

They help you with social problems.
The teacher's aide makes me sick and the secretary is unfriendly.
The activities we get to do.
I hate the teacher. I don't belong here.
I'm not used to staying in one class all day.
I like it better because I am around when I'm there. I am around every day and it helps me concentrate, I want to come school and I want an education. I've been here a year and have learned a lot.
It's better at lunch.
It is not a play house.
It is a nice place to be. It helped me change my behavior.

7. How much do you feel that you are learning at this school compared to the one which you last attended?

11	(50%)	more
7	(32%)	about the same
4	(18%)	less

8. Do you think that you're getting a better idea of what kinds of jobs are available when you get out of school from attending this school than you were from the previous school?

16	(73%)	yes
6	(27%)	no

9. If you had your choice, where would you like to attend school next fall?

1	(05%)	I'd like to stay at this school
2	(09%)	I'd like to go back to my old school
19	(86%)	I'd rather go to some other school

For the 19 respondents who chose the third option, 16 named a particular school that they wished to attend. All were regular schools in the Dade Public School System, but only one was the school formerly attended.

(9) If the third option was specified:

None indicated (two responses)
Edison or Jackson
Central (two responses)
Another program
Killian
Springs Sr.
John F. Kennedy
Mia. Beach High
Mia. Jackson Sr. (two responses)
Norland Sr.
N. Mia. Beach
N. Miami
Mia. Beach
Edison Sr.
Hialeah Jr.
Carol City

10. Do you think that you will be able to graduate from High School?

22 (100%) yes
0 (00%) no

11. What do you plan to do after you get out of school? :

I plan to be a model or cosmictology.

I plan to get a good paying job settle down and maybe after a year or two have a son or a daughter.

Go to college to be a doctor or a model

Go to collage and be a lawyer or docter Go to Law School for 12 yrs and go to Med-School at less 8 yrs.

Enroll in some kind if Milatary Armed Forces, or even if I could go to college and major in Business and Management. Howard University and Alabama State University are my choices.

I plan to go to Jackson Jr. High and finish school.

I would like to be a electrical engineer.

get a Job And have four kids and a wife

I plan on to become a stunt woman but I would like to go to U.C.L.A. As soon as I get out of school. My second goal is to become a basketplayer.

I hope to become and Secretary in the near future and hope to go to college one day.

Go to college and get 4 degrees for being a longshoreman.

become police men

I'm going to the marines for four year come home, and go to colleage and get my master degree.

I would like to get a career at Win Dixe and retier a produce manerger in ten years. Then I would like to become a Sales man for Kraft dary group, Seltest.

Wait two months then go to college.

I want to Be a pilat when I get ot of college

I plan to go to college and get a job then get married and have a family.

Be a cosmetic or a model.

Get a job and take care of my self and my two little twin girls.

go to the army or the Marine corp.

May be go to college. or get a better job than I have now. Make something of myself.

Go to college. If I don't go to college I'll be a city worker.

The School Board of Dade County, Florida adheres to a policy of nondiscrimination in educational programs/activities and employment and strives affirmatively to provide equal opportunity for all as required by:

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 - prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended - prohibits discrimination in employment on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 - prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex.

Age Discrimination Act of 1967, as amended - prohibits discrimination on the basis of age between 40 and 70.

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 - prohibits discrimination against the handicapped.

Florida Educational Equity Act - prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, sex, national origin, marital status or handicap against a student or employee.

Veterans are provided re-employment rights in accordance with P.L. 93–508 (Federal) and Section 295.07, Florida Statutes, which also stipulates categorical preferences for employment.